



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/977,681

10/16/2001

Shinji Yoshihara

15-015

3846

23400

7590

04/29/2003

POSZ & BETHARDS, PLC
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE
SUITE 10
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

BAUMEISTER, BRADLEY W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/977,681

Applicant(s)
Yoshihara et al.

Examiner
B. William Baumeister

Art Unit
2815



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) B. William Baumeister (PTO)

(3) _____

(2) Kerry Culpepper (Applicant's Representative)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 28, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:
George '228

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed rejections based on George.


The Examiner agrees with applicant's arguments that "slanted sidewalls" do not constitute "rounded edges" as set forth in claim 7 as defined by the specification. No agreement was reached as to whether George teaches that the substrate may be p-type, or whether a structural distinction results from epitaxially-growing layer 12 of George vs forming it through diffusion. Proposed amendment would not be considered after final as claim 7 has been amended to further include the limitations of claim 11. The finality of the Office Action would be withdrawn and a new action would be issued if an after-final response includes at least claim 7 being maintained (in independent form) without any further amendments. However, the issue of patentability requires further consideration and search.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


4/28/03
Examiner's signature, if required